

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, and 13-17 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action dated Feb. 2, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,544,250 (“Urbanski”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,563,931 (“Soli”) and U.S. Pat. No. 4,420,655 (“Suzuki”); rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbanski in view of Suzuki and U.S. Pat. No. 5,937,070 (“Todter”); and rejected claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbanski in view of Soli and Todter. Applicants request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

II. Interview Summary

On May 28, 2009, Examiner Michael C. Colucci and Scott W. Brim conducted a telephone interview to discuss the independent claims of the present application and the present combination of Urbanski and Soli as contemplated by the Examiner. Applicants thank the Examiner for the opportunity of this case.

During the telephone interview, Applicants generally explained their interpretation in the independent claims of the received-speech signal (the received speech) received at the speech communication apparatus, and the adjustment of the gain of the received-speech signal based on background noise at the speech communication apparatus. Possible amendments to the independent claims were also discussed to clarify that the received-speech signal is transmitted to the speech communication apparatus and that the received-speech signal comprises speech that is not received from a user of the speech communication apparatus.

A general agreement was reached that if the independent claims were amended to clarify that the received-speech signal is transmitted to the speech communication apparatus and that the received-speech signal comprises speech that is not received from a user of the speech communication apparatus, the independent claims would be distinguishable from the present combination of Urbanski and Soli as contemplated by the Examiner. Accordingly, in this Amendment, Applicants have amended the

independent claims to clarify the received-speech signal. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections to the claims in light of the amendments to the claims.

III. Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200